

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI  
GREENVILLE DIVISION

CARL PORTER

PLAINTIFF

V.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 4:19-CV-00049-RP

GLORIA CARTER,  
C.O. VICTORIA ECKFORD, and  
C.O. HONEYCUT

DEFENDANTS

ORDER

This matter comes before the court upon Plaintiff's motion for the production of documents and electronically stored information. Doc. # 38. Defendants have now responded. Doc. # 53. Upon due consideration, the Court finds that the instant motion [38] should be **GRANTED in part and DENIED in part**. The Court now addresses each of Plaintiff's requests separately:

*(1) Inmate count roster for Unit 30, A-Building, B zone for October 14-16, 2018*

Defendants have responded that they have no objection and can produce said roster for October 16, 2018, but are unable to locate the roster for October 14 and 15, 2018. Thus, this request is **GRANTED**.

*(2) Officers' clock-in list for Defendants Gloria Carter, Victoria Eckford, and Michael Honeycutt for October 14-16, 2018*

Defendants have responded that they have no objection and can produce the named officers' clock-in lists for these dates. This request is, therefore, **GRANTED**.

*(3) Officers' pass-on log for Unit 30-A for October 14-16, 2018*

Defendants have responded that they are unable to locate any such log, but can produce a copy of the Unit Register. Accordingly, this request is **GRANTED** as modified.

*(4) Any security footage around Unit 30-A during the relevant time period*

Defendants have responded that no such security footage exists. Consequently, this particular request is **DENIED**.

*(5) Disciplinary history for Gloria Carter, Victoria Eckford, and Michael Honeycutt relating to assaults, and any ARPs alleging the same*

Defendants have responded that there are no documents related to any of the named officers' disciplinary records. Defendants object to producing any ARPs filed against them, arguing that this request is overly broad and unduly burdensome. As Plaintiff has not demonstrated good cause for the request, the Court agrees. Thus, this request is **DENIED**.

*(6) Plaintiff's medical records from Van Meter oral surgery*

Defendants have responded that they have no objection and will produce all such dental records in their custody and control. This request is, therefore, **GRANTED**.

*(7) Policies, procedures, and guidelines, to be followed when there is an inmate on inmate assault witnessed by staff.*

Defendants object and argue that disclosure of such policies would compromise safety and jeopardize investigations. As Plaintiff has failed to show why he needs such information, the Court finds that this request is **DENIED**.

**SO ORDERED**, this the 24th day of February, 2020.

/s/ Roy Percy  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE